



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/797,639

03/09/2004

Uwe DeWinter

8966.23

4744

21999 7590 11/28/2007

KIRTON AND MCCONKIE
60 EAST SOUTH TEMPLE,
SUITE 1800
SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84111

EXAMINER

BRADEN, SHAWN M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3781

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

11/28/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/797,639

Applicant(s)

DEWINTER, UWE

Examiner

Shawn M. Braden

Art Unit

3781

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 July 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9,10 and 12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,9,10,12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 07/27/2007 has been entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1,9,10,12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Josephs (USPN 4,854,460) in view of Woodruff (USPN 2,086,688).

Josephs discloses the invention substantially as claimed. Josephs discloses a rectangular, refrigerated freight container having length width and height dimensions of a standard size, a roof, a floor, walls, a door frame and two doors at one end, the doors being of the same height and extending to the floor of the container, the door having locks (130) which can only be operated from inside the container, wherein the other door has an internal door release mechanism (150,152,134) with a release knob (152) accessible from inside the container that acts on an external door release mechanism, and wherein a security bar (200 or 132) can be locked between the two doors to prevent

operation of the external door release mechanism, and wherein a part of the door frame itself forms the bottom of the container such that the frame will be in contact with the ground when the container is set down (fig. 9). However Josephs does not disclose the doors with substantially different width dimensions.

Woodruff teaches two different sized doors in the same field of endeavor for the purpose of adding versatility to the opening.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the doors have different sizes as taught by Woodruff in order to add versatility to the opening.

4. With respect to claim 9, both Josephs and woodruff show a customs seal can be applied to the security bar.

5. With respect to claim 10, Josephs as applied to claim 1, shows an end face of the container has a door frame which is reinforced (50,52) to prevent skewing of the frame if it is resting on uneven ground.

6. With respect to claim 12, Josephs as applied to claim 1, shows the doors extend the full height of the container so that when both doors are opened, access to that end of the container is unobstructed to allow loading of the container (fig.1).

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 07/27/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. In response to applicant's argument "Applicant respectfully disagrees that the bar 152 of Josephs functions as an internal door release mechanism".

Examiner draws attention to Josephs (fig. 11) which shows a drawing of the release

mechanism in cross section. Element (152) has the structure and recitation as set forth as the amended "knob". It is well within the skill of a user that is trapped inside container to turn the knob (152) in order to release themselves. Examiner also states the internal knob (152) is longer than the external release mechanism (132) therefore a user could apply more force to the internal side than to the external side.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shawn M. Braden whose telephone number is (571)272-8026. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Friday 9-6:30 est.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Anthony Stashick can be reached on (571)272-4561. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Application/Control Number:
10/797,639
Art Unit: 3781

Page 5

Smb

smb

ANTHONY D. STASHICK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700

Anthony D. Stashick
ANTHONY D. STASHICK
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3700